



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

em

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/760,222	01/21/2004	Kia Silverbrook	RRA14US	1377

24011 7590 09/14/2007
SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD
393 DARLING STREET
BALMAIN, 2041
AUSTRALIA

EXAMINER

MARTIN, LAURA E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2853

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/14/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/760,222

Applicant(s)

SILVERBROOK, KIA

Examiner

Laura E. Martin

Art Unit

2853

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 4 and 5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 4 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/23/07 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 2, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silverbrook (US 6443555 B1) in view of Torgerson (US 6722759 B2).

Silverbrook discloses the following claim limitations:

As per claim 5: a body (figure 15, element 1) configured for user insertion and removal from a complementary cradle in an ink jet printer (figure 3, element 56); printing fluid storage mounted to the body (figure 11, element 6); a pagewidth printhead mounted to the body for printing a media substrate when inserted in the complementary

Art Unit: 2853

cradle (figure 15, element 3), the pagewidth printhead having a first print chip and a second print chip (figure 13); and a fluid connection between the printing fluid storage and the first and second print chips (figure 19), wherein user removal and replacement of the body simultaneously removes and replaces the printing fluid storage, the pagewidth printhead, and the fluid connection (the user can be anyone; if the printing fluid storage, pagewidth printhead, and fluid connection can be put into the printer, they can also be removed; each module has a fluid connection that connects the ink to the nozzles, as well as a small amount of ink for printing, which can be also determined as an area of fluid storage).

As per claim 2: the first and second printhead chips abut together (figure 19)

Silverbrook does not disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 5: the first print chip having an array of nozzles fabricated on a first monolithic substrate and the second print chip having an array of nozzles fabricated on a second monolithic substrate, the length of the first print chip added to the length of the second print chip is at least equal to the length of the pagewidth printheads.

As per claim 4: electrical connects located at opposing ends of the printhead and in electrical communication with the first and second print chips respectively.

Torgerson discloses the following claim limitations:

As per claim 5: the first print chip having an array of nozzles fabricated on a first monolithic substrate and the second print chip having an array of nozzles fabricated on a second monolithic substrate, the length of the first print chip added to the length of the

Art Unit: 2853

second print chip is at least equal to the length of the pagewidth printheads (figure 3, the substrate is monolithic – the first and second monolithic substrates are the same).

As per claim 4: electrical connectors (figure 2, element 74) located at opposing ends of the printhead and in electrical communication with the first and second print chips respectively (column 5, line 43-column 6, line 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the printhead taught by Silverbrook with the disclosure of Torgerson in order to provide a better controlled printhead.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/23/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Torgerson does not teach a printer cartridge with two print chips and two monolithic surfaces. Silverbrook teaches two print chips, and Torgerson teaches monolithic surfaces; nowhere in the claim does it state that the monolithic surfaces cannot be the same surface.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura E. Martin whose telephone number is (571) 272-2160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:00 - 3:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen D. Meier can be reached on (571) 272-2149. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2853

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Laura E. Martin


9/12/07
MANISH S. SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER